Kandukrishi were bound to supply grass (Dharmapullu) for the use of the cattle in the Ambalapuzha temple and that those holders were paid at rates varying from 1 to 1½ nalies of paddy for every bundle of grass supplied. The grass was supplied every month and the payment was now being made at the end of the year in money at the commutation rate of 2¾ fanams per para of paddy. If the holders of the said lands defaulted in the supply of grass, a fine of 1½ chackrams per bundle was recovered from them. He pointed out that the above rates were not equitable as the fine imposed was out of proportion to the value payable for each bundle of grass supplied. He added that the holders of the lands in question were making the supply in the mistaken impression that it was a service or *oolium* attached to the holding itself. He contended that the supply of grass to the temple was not a condition precedent to the holding of the lands for the following reasons :—

(*a*) All the *nelpura* lands were not liable to the service. The service was insisted on only in the case of the lands attached to six *nelpuras* situated near the temple.

(*b*) The rate for each bundle of grass was not uniform. It varied from one nali to 1½ nalies, according to the distances of the lands concerned from the temple. The arrangement was really in the nature of a contract and it was blindly followed ever since, thereby reducing the contract to something like an *oolium* or service.

(*c*) The supply of grass to other temples in the State was made through contractors and not by the ryots.

(*d*) Even if it be considered to be in the nature of a cess, such cesses were abolished by para 342 of Mr. Ramiengar's Settlement Memorandum.

The Member, therefore, requested that the holders of *Kandukrishi* lands might be absolved from the liability to supply *dharmapullu* and that the supply might be arranged through contractors in future.

The Member next proceeded to consider the grievances of the ryots in the matter of paying the annual tax on *Kandukrishi* lands. He pointed out that, till the year 1086, the system in vogue was to recover the rent on lands lying fallow, only at the next cultivation season. From 1087, the *Kandukrishi* authorities were insisting on the payment of the rent annually without regard to the fallow seasons. The ryots were unable to pay the kist during the fallow seasons. He, therefore, prayed for the revival of the old system of collecting the kist only in the years of cultivation, in the interests of the *Kandukrishi* ryots.

Dewan's reply.—The existing arrangements cannot be interfered with till the next settlement.

4. The necessity for the free granting of permission to sue in respect of Kandukrishi lands without prejudice to the interests of the Government.

Mr. M. Raman Pillai (Member, Neyyattinkara taluk) said that he had made a representation on the subject at the ninth session of the Assembly and that the Government had then promised to call for a report from the Peishkar whether there were any reasons, special to the Neyyattinkara taluk, such as to render it necessary to revise the policy of the Government, as laid down in G. O. No. 1216/L. R. & F., dated 23rd January 1913. The G. O. laid down that permission to redeem simple leases of *Kandukrishi* lands might be granted but that other alienations for valuable consideration would not be recognised by the Government. The Member pointed out that no action was taken on the matter by the Government, as promised by them. He prayed that early action might be taken in the matter.

Dewan's reply.—The Dewan Peishkar, Trivandrum, will be asked to report whether there are any special circumstances, with reference to the *Kandukrishi* lands in the Neyyattinkara taluk, requiring a reconsideration of the G. O. referred to by the Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly